

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amdt. Dated: January 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7 have been amended, Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice, and new Claims 11-14 have been added, leaving Claims 1-5 and 7-14 for consideration upon the entry of the amendments. Page 4, lines 15-22 of the specification, for example, discuss the features of new Claims 11, 13, and 14. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102*

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,663,439 (hereinafter "Henry"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because Henry fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 2.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "A battery connector for a mobile phone, installed in a main body of the mobile phone and contacting a battery terminal to supply power to a printed circuit board (PCB) of the mobile phone, the battery connector comprising: a body having a plurality of plunger housings, each of the plunger housings having a coupling groove formed on an outer surface at a lower end of each of the plunger housings; a plurality of plungers each slidably installed in each of the plurality of plunger housings of the body; a plurality of base cover members each having a cylindrical connection part engaged with the coupling groove of each of the plurality of plunger housings, a bottom surface of each of the base cover members adhered to the PCB by soldering and made of conductive material; and a plurality of coil springs each biasing each of the plungers in each of the plunger housings against the bottom of each of the base cover members." (Emphasis added)

In contrast, Henry fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least the element "each of the plunger housings having a coupling groove formed on an outer surface at a lower end of each of the plunger housings", as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner however,

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amtd. Dated: January 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

has stated on page 4 of the Office Action that the barbs 82 on the beams 78 disclosed in Henry teach the coupling groove. Col. 3, lines 49-52 of Henry teach that barbs 82 extend transversely from sides 79 of the beams 78 and are dimensioned to form an interference-fit between the partitions 50 of the housing 44 (Fig. 2). Therefore, the barbs 82 are not part of the housing 44. Accordingly, Henry does not anticipate Claim 1 for at least the reason that Henry does not teach, either or expressly or inherently, all of the elements of Claim 1.

Claim 2 also includes the element "the housing having a coupling groove formed on an outer surface at a lower end of the housing", and Applicant submits that it is patentable over Henry for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Claims 3-5 and 7-10 depend from Claim 2 and are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 2.

New Claims 11 and 13 include the element "an annular hook being inserted into the coupling groove of each of the plunger housings so that each of the base cover members is engaged with each of the plunger housings", as well as all elements of independent Claims 1 and 2, respectively. New Claim 12 depends from Claim 1, and new Claim 14 depends from Claim 2. Therefore, new Claims 11-14 are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependencies on allowable Claim 1 and 2, respectively.

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amndt. Dated: January 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Soenja Bae

Limited Recognition No. L0017

Confirmation No. 2344

Cantor Colburn LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

PTO Customer No. 23413

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 13, 2006